

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner has continued to reject the present claims, including maintaining the obviousness rejection over Koyanagi et al. (WO 03/072634 A1, US 2005/0153230 A1) in view of Wyatt et al. (US 2003/0118946 A1).

In response, Applicants submit that while Koyanagi et al. disclose tetramethylbenzene having 10 carbon atoms as a specific example of a developer and Wyatt et al. disclose a developing solution comprising diisopropylbenzene having 12 carbon atoms as an essential component, neither Koyanagi et al. nor Wyatt et al. disclose or suggest that tetramethylbenzene has the same developing properties as diisopropylbenzene.

The Examiner indicated that tetramethylbenzene is an aromatic hydrocarbon, but pending independent claim 3 of the present application has been amended so as to have a limitation that the aromatic hydrocarbon is basically C₉ or C₁₀-based. Nonetheless, the Examiner has combined Koyanagi et al. disclosing tetramethylbenzene having 10 carbon atoms and Wyatt et al. disclosing only diisopropylbenzene having 12 carbon atoms.

In addition, the composition of Example 4 in Wyatt et al. contains 20 wt % of benzyl alcohol and 60 wt % of isoparaffinic hydrocarbon. On the other hand, in pending independent claim 3 of the present application, the other solvent other than aprotic polar solvents is limited to the specific compounds and does not include the above-mentioned alcohol or isoparaffinic hydrocarbon.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to use tetramethylbenzene in an amount of 20% by mass in a developer consisting of tetramethylbenzene, cyclohexanone and propylene glycol monomethyl ether acetate which does

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Application No.: 10/582,787

Attorney Docket No.: Q79148

not contain the above-mentioned alcohol or isoparaffinic hydrocarbon, based on the diisopropylbenzene content of 20 wt % in a developer containing solvents which are not included in the remover of the present invention.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that the Examiner's position is not proper because the Examiner cites a prior document relating to an aromatic hydrocarbon having 12 carbon atoms although an aromatic hydrocarbon used in the present invention is basically C₉ or C₁₀-based. In other words, Wyatt's Example 4 fairly teaches only 20% by mass of diisopropylbenzene in particular, not 20% by mass of an aromatic hydrocarbon in general.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection over Koyanagi et al. in view of Wyatt et al. is respectfully requested.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 14, 2009